

## REMARKS

1. Claims 1-28 are pending in this application. Reconsideration and further prosecution of the above-identified application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and discussion that follows.

The claims are subject to a restriction requirement. In particular, the Examiner asserts that the claims include "Species A, the embodiment which includes the additional substrate 70" and "Species B, the alternative embodiment defined at PG PUB (20040067029) paragraph 0043 which does not use the additional substrate 70" (Office Action of 6/30/05, page 2). In response, the applicant elects Species A, with traverse.

2. In general, "There are two criteria for a proper requirement for restriction between patentably distinct inventions: (A) the inventions must be independent . . . and (B) There must be a serious burden on the examiner" (MPEP §803.01). In the case at hand, the Examiner has failed to meet either criteria.

In addition, "Examiners must provide reasons and/or examples to support conclusions" (MPEP §803.01). In the case at hand, the Examiner has failed to provide any reasons or conclusion.

In general, the Examiner has failed to provide any basis, at all, for suggesting that the presence of an additional substrate should form the basis for a patentably distinct invention. Consequently, a search directed to Species A would necessarily require the searching of the features of Species B. Thus, there is no purpose served by the restriction since no reduction in the number of search


classifications or scope of search is achieved. Further, the practicalities and efficiencies of searching all categories at one time would be totally lost if restriction is required, resulting in duplicative searching which is wasteful of the Patent Office's time and effort.

It general, claim 1-28 are readable on Species A. It is believed in this regard that claims 3 and 15 are readable on Species A because the auxiliary substrate of claims 3 and 15 may be used in conjunction with other additional substrates that are covered by Claims 1 and 12. Similar reasoning applies to claims 1, 2, 4-14 and 16-28.

4. Allowance of claims 1-28, as now presented, is believed to be in order and such action is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of the subject application, he is respectfully requested to telephone applicant's undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

WELSH & KATZ, LTD.

By:   
Jon P. Christensen  
Registration No. 34,137

July 25, 2005  
WELSH & KATZ, LTD.  
120 S. Riverside Plaza  
22nd Floor  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
312-655-1500